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ABSTRACT
Beginning in the 1940s, academics recognized a gap between themselves and practitioners and contemplated methods of reducing this divide. Evidence for this gap includes recognition that academics and practitioners have different audiences, viewpoints, interests, intellectual approaches, research methods, and styles of discourse. Although much has been written about this topic and many solutions for closing this gap have been offered, there is growing concern among some scholars that this gap is increasing. Using a recent survey of current and lapsed members conducted for the American Society for Public Administration, we assess the current state of the gap between academics and practitioners on a range of ASPA services and priorities. Our findings suggest that demographic variables are more robust predictors of attitudinal differences among ASPA members as opposed to academic-practitioner views. Recognizing these differences may prove critical for ASPA as a professional forum of relevance as well as for promoting greater connectedness in public administration programs.
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The concept of a knowledge gap between academics and practitioners that has precluded collaboration is long standing. As early as the 1940s, academics recognized the need to develop methods for reducing the collaborative divide
between themselves and practitioners. Among the causes for the intellectual divide are recognition that academics and practitioners have different audiences, viewpoints, interests, intellectual approaches, research methods, and styles of discourse. There is growing concern among some scholars that the divide is increasing, warranting further consideration from academics and practitioners alike (Posner, 2009; Raadschelders & Lee, 2011).

In the research presented here, we assess the intellectual divide in public administration among academics and practitioners. To assess the extent of the knowledge gap in public administration, we use a 2010 survey of American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) members. ASPA serves as a vital forum for connecting academics and practitioners across a variety of subfields and levels of public sector employment (Newland, 2000). Facilitating this link is ASPA’s sponsorship of a variety of publications providing timely research that links practice and theory through empirical analyses, informed practical analyses and commentaries, and constructive literature reviews and correspondence. Likewise, the survey provides an opportunity for assessing the extent that Web-based technologies and ASPA-related literature enhance access to information and expanded avenues for illustrating practical experiences in the classroom.

We take up the task by first reviewing the literature on academic-practitioner differences, reflecting on potential sources for the divide and proposed remedies. Our research then addresses employing the ASPA survey for identifying division among academics and practitioners on a selection of services (e.g., publications, continuing education, recognition, professional standards, and networking) and future priorities. Finally, we discuss the findings in light of the vital role ASPA plays as the primary conduit for academic-practitioner collaboration.

**Considering the Academic-Practitioner Divide**

The intellectual divide among academics and practitioners has received considerable attention over the last decade. Public administration scholarship, in particular, has considered the reasons for and solutions to the intellectual gap as an important topic for the field (Raadschelders & Lee, 2011; Newland, 2000; Ospina & Dodge, 2005a, 2005b; Stivers, 2000). Indeed, research suggests that the gap in academic-practitioner relations is more of a “chasm” in critical need of knowledge and research congruities (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003). According to Goodin, Rein, & Moran (2006), professional schools have become increasingly focused on enhancing students’ academic portfolios and skills in lieu of pragmatic solutions that might contribute to practice. Additionally, Posner (2009) cites the declining numbers of practitioners attending conferences as further evidence of the increasing gap—a problematic finding given the role professional conferences have played in encouraging academics and practitioners toward collaboration.

The unique intellectual approaches respective of each of the two groups may hinder collaboration between academics and practitioners (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Roper, 2002). Different intellectual traditions motivate each group’s search for
knowledge. Academics are interested in theoretical pursuits that advance their goals of original research and tenure (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003). Practitioners, on the other hand, are in need of readily available knowledge for practical solutions to achieving organizational effectiveness (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003). Though both are concerned with causal inference, the academic researcher seeks to identify generalizable rules that lead to probabilistic predictions (Roper, 2002). This aim requires experimentation, employing complicated quantitative analyses that most practitioners are unfamiliar with. Although academic research is often open ended and ongoing, practitioners, in contrast, are often attempting to solve a particular problem, in a particular setting, within a limited time frame (Roper, 2002). Academics and practitioners have different research interests, and academics often use research techniques that fail to provide answers to questions of concern to practitioners (Campbell, Daft, & Hulin, 1982; Deadrick & Gibson, 2009; Hyatt et al., 1997; Sussman & Evered, 1978). Instead of addressing pragmatic concerns and offering solutions to current problems, academic research often does not align with practitioner needs. Yet, even if academics address the topics of concern for practitioners, there is no guarantee that this new knowledge will be disseminated to those who need it most.

Thus, how knowledge gained through research and practice is disseminated is a further potential roadblock to progress (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Hollenbeck, DeRue, & Guzzo, 2004; Rynes, Brown, & Colbert, 2002). The transference of knowledge through various mediums is increasingly viewed as an obstacle to ensuring that academic research is accessible to practitioners. Rather than scholarship being irrelevant to practice, the problem is that practitioners are unaware of the findings of academic research (Hollenbeck et al., 2004). In fact, knowledge transference is complicated in public administration by the motivation among scholars to publish in academic-oriented journals versus practitioner-oriented periodicals (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Raadschelders & Lee, 2011). Unfortunately, topics of interest to practitioners are seldom addressed in academic journals (Szajna, 1994). Moreover, many practitioners may fail to read academic publications, primarily because they are riddled with jargon and statistical methods difficult to comprehend (Rynes et al., 2002). Academics in pursuit of tenure and promotion goals often fail to write for a practitioner audience, neglecting practice-oriented publications and reporting findings in esoteric terms (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Rynes et al., 2002). In addition, Roper (2002) suggests academics have a style of discourse that is consensual and participatory while practitioners are deferential to authority relationships where discourse is hierarchical. When academics converse with practitioners in the same way that they interact with their peers, such an approach is likely to incite “culture clashes” that may hinder collaboration efforts (Roper, 2002, p. 340). Yet, even among academics, especially from different intellectual approaches, the dialogue is not always one of accommodation (see, e.g., Simon, 1952; Waldo, 1952a, 1952b; Luton, 2007, 2008; Meier & O’Toole, 2007). Moreover, the perceived rigidness of relationships in the public
sector is not always so, especially in the case of middle- and higher-ranking career
civil servants who interact with political superiors (Page & Jenkins, 2005). Thus,
communicating knowledge gained from research and practice can create unfore-
seen consequences.

Finally, the method of study employed by academics and practitioners may
vary, causing further friction. Although academics seek data to support their quest
for scientific rigor in the course of knowledge creation, practitioners are driven
by logic that may be gained from practical case studies (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003).
It is often assumed that the use of complicated jargon and rigorous methodologies
by academics may fail to impress practitioners who are skeptical or threatened by
the expertise of researchers (Roper, 2002). There is a fear among researchers that
rigorous academic models can potentially distance practitioners even further as
knowledge transference becomes problematic for practitioners not as well versed
in quantitative statistical methodologies (Roper, 2002). Conceivably, the disconnect
over jargon and statistical analysis may be more a factor of the usefulness of aca-
demic investigations for the day-to-day activities of practitioners.

Recommendations for Closing the Gap

Given the many obstacles to bridging the gap between academics and practi-
tioners, attempts to reconcile the two worlds may be problematic given their
different goals and values (Powell & Owen-Smith, 1998; Rynes, Giluk, & Brown,
2007). These goals and values may be so ingrained and institutionalized that only
a systematic overhaul could pave the way for closing the gap. Furthermore, univ-
ersity standards may compound the divide between academics and practitioners.
For example, to maintain academic status, business schools focus on analytics and
problem finding rather than on problem solving and implementation (Hughes,
focus on conducting research for publication in academic journals as a means
for furthering their careers in the university system. The hiring and promotion
process in universities entrenches this divide by deemphasizing experiences in
public or private organizations and publications in practitioner-oriented journals
(Posner, 2009).

Yet, suggestions abound for bridging the gap between academics and practi-
tioners. Scholars have suggested a number of ways for narrowing the intellectual
divide, including pedagogical solutions (McSwite, 2001; Milam, 2003; Posner,
2009), topic usefulness for practice (Lidman & Sommers, 2005; Ospina & Dodge,
2005a, 2005b; Posner, 2009; Rynes et al., 2002), professional interactions through
conferences (Posner, 2009), and collaboration models (Amabile et al., 2001;
Roper, 2002).

In an effort to reach a broader audience, academics should consider practi-
tioner journals, magazines, and other media for disseminating their work (Rynes
et al., 2002). To facilitate collaboration, academic research and journals should
address the most pressing concerns of society; and academic conferences should highlight areas of interest to practitioners (Posner, 2009). Academics should also be cognizant of the language barrier between themselves and practitioners and so avoid using complicated jargon to report results. In addition, academics should clearly explicate the practical implications of their research findings. Posner (2009) suggests that universities should consider adjusting promotion and tenure decisions to give greater weight to contributions made in research, writing, and consulting done in public policy and business.

Professional conferences are often viewed as a primary conduit for anticipating the usefulness of topics explored and transferring knowledge from results (Newland, 2000; Posner, 2009). Gatherings of academics and practitioners during annual professional meetings afford time for face-to-face interaction and communication—avenues that offer the best prospects for knowledge transfer between academics and practitioners. Academics and practitioners can potentially collaborate through forums such as professional associations, informal work groups, policy issue networks, and conferences such as the ASPA National Conference. In addition, Web 2.0 technologies (e.g., weblogs, wikis, social networking sites, and social bookmarking applications) provide online forums for facilitating academic-practitioner discussions regarding current events. Online forums for communication, such as webinars, present an alternative to more traditional avenues for sharing the results of academic studies in the classroom (Milam, 2003; Posner, 2009).

The potential for “pracademics” to serve as facilitators in bridging the knowledge divide has not gone unnoticed. According to Posner (2009), pracademics are exposed to both theory and practice, and are therefore in a position to contribute to both enterprises. For Posner, universities should be the driving force behind academic-practitioner collaborations in the form of pracademics. Moreover, he posits that students should use their theoretical background and research skills to conduct evidence-based research that improves our understanding of public service. Students should spend time working in public and private organizations, and universities should invite practitioners to give lectures and work with students. Although Posner (2009) notes that few articles have been written about this group of individuals, there is a growing recognition of their importance.

Finally, Amabile et al. (2001) propose a set of collaboration models aimed to help academics and practitioners work together to solve problems. Their model of cross-profession collaboration argues that successful collaboration depends on collaborative team characteristics, collaboration environment characteristics, and collaboration processes. Roper (2002) argues that collaboration efforts will prove successful if the goals of such efforts are clear, recognizable, and engagement oriented.

**ASSESSING ACADEMIC-PRACTITIONER PERCEPTIONS**

The literature develops a clear case for continued assessment of academic-practitioner differences and suggestions for bridging the gap. For public administratio-
tion, academics have been tasked with articulating and recognizing the emergent needs of practitioners in their research efforts (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Posner, 2009; Stivers, 2000). Indeed, linking academic and practitioner interests has been a critical issue of public administration journals (e.g., PAR) and associations such as the American Society for Public Administration (Newland, 2000). Our research is a step in the direction of identifying the differences and priorities of academics and practitioners as a means of moving toward bridging the gap in public administration. To this end, we use a survey of ASPA members regarding services and priorities of the organization. Specifically, we analyze academic and practitioner perceptions of ASPA services and priorities that capture elements identified by the literature as potential obstacles to sources for collaboration.

The usefulness of services and publications for bridging the potential knowledge gap between academics and practitioners is well documented (Hollenbeck et al., 2004; Rynes et al., 2002; Roper, 2002). Indeed, this link is an essential element of ASPA as a forum for academic-practitioner collaboration (Newland, 2000; Stivers, 2000). This is especially true of ASPA’s annual conference, which serves as a nexus for building awareness of useful research and professional services (Posner, 2009). Continuing education, networking, and other professional service opportunities are noted conduits for supporting mutual interests among academics and practitioners (Newland, 2000; Posner, 2009). Given the increase in quantitative statistical methodology and dearth of practitioner contributions noted in ASPA’s publication Public Administration Review, there is a real concern for research and service usefulness (see Raadschelders & Lee, 2011). Thus, our analysis includes ASPA services such as continuing education, professional recognition, and networking opportunities as well as publications (Public Administration Review and The Public Manager) in our assessment of academic-practitioner differences.

Another fundamental construct is the usefulness of subject matter addressed by academics and practitioners (Ang & Straub, 2011; Campbell et al., 1982; Deadrick & Gibson, 2009; Hyatt et al., 1997; Roper, 2002; Sussman & Evered, 1978). Academics and practitioners often have different interests and viewpoints that influence their respective priorities. Specifically, the field of public administration is tasked with prioritizing research that addresses fundamental questions of government and society (Raadschelders & Lee, 2011). The extent to which ASPA has established priorities that tackle such fundamental issues is critical to the future of the organization’s ability to connect academics and practitioners (Newland, 2000; Posner, 2009). Social equity, professional development, globalism, nonprofit management, and policy making frequently have been cited as essential priorities for ASPA (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Newland, 2000; Raadschelders & Lee, 2011; Stivers, 2000). Accordingly, our analyses account for the usefulness of priorities established by ASPA, including social equity, professional credentialing and development activities, globalism, and influencing policy making.
DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The analyses here use a 2010 survey of American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) members, conducted electronically between March 16 and April 5. The survey was developed in cooperation with ASPA and loaded on the online survey system of the Florida Survey Research Center (FSRC) at the University of Florida. The FSRC system permits complex branching and question patterns. A list of current and lapsed members with e-mail addresses was obtained from ASPA. Each potential respondent was sent an e-mail that explained the project and provided a unique user id and password. Once the respondent submitted a response, that access information could not be used by another participant. The submitted information was automatically saved. The following analyses comprise 1,023 respondents, including 651 current members of ASPA and 372 lapsed members. The results presented concern current member perceptions. The model offered and tested here provides practitioners and researchers a better understanding of perceptions regarding ASPA services and benefits. Services and benefits offered by ASPA give members an opportunity to interact and communicate best practices through a professional association—an opportunity that is fundamentally important to academic-practitioner knowledge transfer (Posner, 2009).

The data provide us with an opportunity to assess academic-practitioner perceptions regarding the value of services crucial to knowledge transfer, such as publications, networking, outreach, professional development, and continuing education. Furthermore, the data assess academic-practitioner perceptions of ASPA priorities, including social equity, globalism, professional credentialing, continuing education, nonprofit management, and policy making. Such issues speak to the viability and importance of ASPA as a professional association.

Tables 1 and 2 present ASPA member perceptions of services and priorities using the academic-practitioner literature as an organizing point. Using nine ASPA service items and seven ASPA priorities culled from the survey, we perform difference of means tests for academic-practitioner differences on the items. As the tables illustrate, the results are mixed; differences among the two groups of members depend on the specific service or priority. Although academics and practitioners differ significantly on a number of items, the results indicate that only a few items are starkly different.

Table 1 presents the results for member responses to nine specific ASPA service items corroborated by the earlier literature review—publications, continuing education/professional development, support and recognition for the profession, create and uphold professional standards, networking opportunities, Public Administration Review, The Public Manager, the ASPA National Conference, and Web-based training. Overall, nearly 60% emphasized the importance of ASPA’s publication offerings, and there was a significant difference between academics and practitioners regarding the service. This finding indicates that most of the respondents find ASPA’s publications of importance, but it is also
evident that over 40% indicated lower levels of importance regarding this service area. Significant differences in the responses of academics and practitioners are found for three other service areas—continuing education, networking, and Web-based training. With respect to continuing education, though a slight majority of all respondents specified the importance of the service area, academic and practitioner responses differ significantly. Most practitioners (approximately 52%) expressed the importance of continuing education and professional development; however, only 38% of academics indicated the same level of importance. Just as with publications, we see that 49% of respondents indicated lower levels of importance for continuing education and professional development services offered by ASPA. In response to networking with other ASPA members, nearly 59% of all respondents expressed the importance of this opportunity. More than 67% of academics expressed similar sentiment with regard to networking opportunities, as compared to 57% of practitioners. For the service areas of “support and recognition for the profession” and “create and uphold professional standards,” the differences between academics and practitioners were not found to be significant by the difference of means test. However, it is interesting to note that nearly 55% of respondents fail to see the importance of the role ASPA plays in supporting and promoting public service—a remarkable finding given that a tenet of ASPA’s mission is to promote “the value of joining and elevating the public service profession” (ASPA, 2011). Our assessment of academic-practitioner perceptions for Web 2.0 technologies—in this instance, the use of webinars—is significant: Only 20% of academics were convinced of the merits of its usefulness. This finding suggests academics have yet to be convinced of the pedagogical advantages of technology as advocated elsewhere (see Milam, 2003; Posner, 2009).

The last items in Table 1 assess the importance of specific ASPA publications. Although none of the responses were found to be significant based on the difference of means tests, the results are nonetheless interesting. With respect to Public Administration Review, nearly 70% of all members indicate the journal is of importance to ASPA membership, and academic and practitioner members expressed similar levels of support. However, attitudes toward The Public Manager are less than favorable—nearly 46% of members indicated the publication is an important benefit of membership in ASPA. Even more telling is the difference between academics and practitioners regarding The Public Manager—only 36% of academics indicated that the publication is important, compared with 48% of practitioners. Members were also asked to indicate the level of importance the ASPA National Conference has to membership. The difference between academic-practitioner perceptions is not statistically significant, but it is noteworthy that less than 50% of respondents felt the national conference was an important benefit of membership in ASPA. This finding is troubling, especially when the conference is seen as a leading avenue for strengthening academic-practitioner discussions (Posner, 2009).
Table 1.
Academic and Practitioner Perceptions of ASPA Services (percentage agreeing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>57.0*</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 630; mean = 3.51; SD = 1.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education/Professional Development</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>52.4**</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 603; mean = 3.30; SD = 1.35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Recognition for the Profession</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 616; mean = 3.25; SD = 1.27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create and Uphold Professional Standards</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 624; mean = 3.33; SD = 1.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking Opportunities</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>57.0*</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 630; mean = 3.51; SD = 1.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration Review</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 615; mean = 3.85; SD = 1.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web-based Training (webinars)</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>44.9**</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 283; mean = 3.07; SD = 1.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Public Manager</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 328; mean = 3.25; SD = 1.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ASPA National Conference</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 432; mean = 3.27; SD = 1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of means between academic and practitioner respondents. Responses to survey items were coded from most important (5) to least important (1), assigning each survey item a value from 1 to 5. The means and standard deviations (SD) reported reflect variation among individual respondents on these response categories. The table reports the percentage indicating level of importance with each survey item, which is the sum of the percentage who responded with 4 and 5.

*p < .05; **p < .01

Turning to Table 2, member responses to statements regarding ASPA priorities are tested for academic-practitioner differences. As noted earlier, social equity, professional development, globalism, nonprofit management, and policy making frequently have been cited as essential priorities for ASPA (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003; Newland, 2000; Raadschelders & Lee, 2011; Stivers, 2000). Of the seven priorities tested, only ASPA’s priority of globalism tested statistically significant for a difference between academics and practitioners moving forward. Although 57% of academics felt that international issues should be a focus of ASPA, only 44% of practitioners were in agreement. Overall, only 46% of members expressed agreement with including a focus on better appreciation for issues affecting governments worldwide. Again, a noteworthy finding given that a core tenet of ASPA’s mission...
is to build “bridges among all who pursue public purposes at home and internationally” (ASPA, 2011). Not including international issues and nonprofit management, responses to the rest of the priorities illustrate overall agreement with having ASPA dedicate greater energy toward these respective issues.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>All Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A top priority for ASPA should be promoting social equity in all aspects of government programs and policies. ((N = 618; \text{mean} = 3.45; \text{SD} = 1.36))</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should develop its own professional credential for PA professionals. ((N = 602; \text{mean} = 3.47; \text{SD} = 1.40))</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should expand its focus to include international issues that affect the quality of governments worldwide. ((N = 617; \text{mean} = 3.29; \text{SD} = 1.33))</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>44.0**</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should partner with Certified Public Manager (CPM) programs to develop continuing education programs for CPMs. ((N = 562; \text{mean} = 3.64; \text{SD} = 1.32))</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should create a center for nonprofit management. ((N = 586; \text{mean} = 3.39; \text{SD} = 1.34))</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should focus more resources on influencing policy making to improve the quality of government and government services. ((N = 611; \text{mean} = 3.58; \text{SD} = 1.33))</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should focus more resources on a program to help new professionals further their careers. ((N = 620; \text{mean} = 3.77; \text{SD} = 1.31))</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Significance level refers to a two-tailed test of the difference of means between classified and unclassified employees. Responses to survey items were coded from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1), assigning each survey item a value from 1 to 5. The means and standard deviations \((SD)\) reported reflect variation among individual respondents on these response categories. The table reports the “percentage agreeing” with each survey item, which is the sum of the percentage indicating 4 and 5 on the Likert Scale in their responses.

\*\(p < .05\); \**\(p < .01\)
The results from Tables 1 and 2 suggest a few significant differences between academics and practitioners regarding ASPA services and priorities. However, further investigation is warranted to verify the importance of the academic-practitioner classification as a significant predictor of respondent perceptions. Given the prominence of ASPA as the primary association for academic-practitioner outreach, the current survey presents an unprecedented opportunity to assess member perceptions in light of other potential predictors. To further the discussion, multiple regression models were developed for the survey items in Tables 1 and 2, including the academic-practitioner orientation of members. Additionally, the models control for the effects of demographic variables, including tenure in ASPA, gender, age, education, and whether or not ASPA was the respondents’ primary association. The assumption is that services and priorities offered by ASPA should be knowledge relevant to generational (Newland, 2000) and gender-related (Ospina & Dodge, 2005b; Stivers, 2000) concerns.

**FINDINGS**

Because the dependent variables used in this analysis are categorical (ordinal) variables and thus lack the continuous normal distribution assumed for ordinary least squares regression (OLS), logistic regression is used to account for the dichotomous nature of the dependent variables. From our review of Tables 1 and 2, it is apparent that the distributions are skewed. Those who responded to the Likert Scale items regarding ASPA priorities and services were more likely to express positive attitudes. Indeed, for most of the items used, 50% or more responses were positive, opting for response items 4 or 5 on the Likert Scale. Our literature review suggests that perceptions of academic-practitioner knowledge transfer, and more specifically ASPA services and priorities, are not regularly submitted to empirical testing or public opinion. This being the case, we must account for the fact that member attitudes are perhaps less “hard” and less likely to be preformed opinions (Alvarez & Brehm, 2002; Kumlin, 2001). Thus it would be misleading to treat respondent perceptions toward ASPA services and priorities as nuanced as the Likert Scale suggests. Empirically speaking, it would be beneficial for our logistic regression to continue to treat the dependent variables as dichotomous.

The logistic regression models in Tables 3 and 4 assess perceptions of ASPA priorities and services detailed earlier in Tables 1 and 2. The models included independent variables for employment (academic), years in ASPA, gender, age, education level, and whether ASPA was the respondent’s primary professional association. The results of the logistic models examining the ASPA priorities and services are reported in Tables 3 and 4. The likelihood ratios (chi square, or Chi²) indicate that the Table 3 models as a whole are statistically significant (excluding “Support and Recognition for Profession”), indicating it is extremely unlikely that these results are due to chance. We have included the factor change in odds statistics—exp(b)—for a more substantive assessment of the effects of the logistic model. Inclusion of the exp(b) scores allows us to interpret the odds of observing a positive
Table 3.
Impact of Selected Variables on Member Perceptions of ASPA Services (odds ratios with confidence levels in parentheses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Academic Member (1.298)</th>
<th>Years in ASPA (1.001)</th>
<th>Primary Association (1.088)</th>
<th>Gender (0.869)</th>
<th>Age (1.012)</th>
<th>Education (1.393)</th>
<th>Chi²</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>–0.140</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>12.15**</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing Education and Professional Development</td>
<td>–0.166</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>–0.251</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>–0.260</td>
<td>25.98***</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support and Recognition for the Profession</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>–0.008</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.336*</td>
<td>–0.009</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create and Uphold Professional Standards</td>
<td>–0.532**</td>
<td>–0.007</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.501**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.316**</td>
<td>18.95**</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Networking Opportunities</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>–0.140</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.332**</td>
<td>12.15**</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Administration Review</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>–0.009*</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>–0.330*</td>
<td>0.017**</td>
<td>0.285*</td>
<td>14.27**</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Public Manager</td>
<td>–0.062</td>
<td>–0.012</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>–0.090</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>–0.056</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The ASPA National Conference</td>
<td>–0.059</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.419*</td>
<td>0.021**</td>
<td>0.295*</td>
<td>14.03**</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web-based Training (webinars)</td>
<td>–0.0713*</td>
<td>–0.009</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>–0.201</td>
<td>15.58**</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001; **p ≤ .01; *p ≤ .10

Note. Exp(β) in parentheses. Exp(β) = factor change in odds for unit increase in X.

outcome, holding all other variables constant (Long & Freese, 2006). Turning to the results of the logistic regressions for Table 3, education is a strong predictor across the models. The results suggest that the more educated respondents are 1.39 times more likely to feel that publications were important to ASPA membership. Indeed, the same can be said regarding the importance of upholding professional standards and networking: More educated respondents are 1.37 and 1.39 times
more likely to view each respective ASPA service positively. Somewhat surprisingly, the more educated respondents appear to be less enthusiastic toward continuing education (33% less likely) as a service priority of ASPA. Interestingly, academic respondents are roughly 42% less likely to support creating and upholding professional standards as a priority for ASPA. Perhaps as the literature suggests (see Rynes et al., 2002; Rynes et al., 2007), the intellectual approaches of academics are more of a priority as opposed to the ethical concerns of practitioners that appeal to their deference for authority and hierarchy (Roper, 2002). Regarding gender, we find that female respondents are more likely to affirm the importance of support and recognition for the profession (1.4 times more likely than men) and of creating and upholding professional standards (1.65 times more likely than men) as ASPA priorities. Lastly, older respondents are 1.03 times more likely to support continuing education and 1.01 times more likely to support networking as ASPA priorities.

The last four items in Table 3 offer logistic regressions for perceptions of specific publications and webinars offered through ASPA membership. Once again, the likelihood ratios (Chi²) for the regressions in Table 3 indicate that the models as a whole are statistically significant, excluding The Public Manager. In looking at the results for Public Administration Review (PAR), we find that female respondents and those with longer tenure in ASPA are less likely to perceive the journal as an important part of membership. However, older and more educated respondents were more favorable to the utility of the journal as a part of ASPA membership. Female respondents, older respondents, and more educated respondents each viewed the importance of ASPA's national conference favorably. Interestingly, regarding Web-based training, academic members were 51% less likely to view this benefit as an important aspect of ASPA services.

Turning to Table 4, the likelihood ratios (Chi²) for the regressions indicate that the models as a whole are statistically significant excluding the creation of a nonprofit management center and improving the quality of government. Not surprisingly, respondents whose primary professional association is ASPA are more likely to support most of the items as future orientations for the organization. The results were statistically significant for all of the service priorities except for the Certified Public Manager (CPM) program. Interestingly, we see a number of significant differences between academics and practitioners regarding the future of ASPA. When asked about establishing professional credentialing and resources for career advancement as priorities for ASPA, academics were 1.52 and 1.73 times more likely than practitioners to support these goals than practitioners were when controlling for all other variables. Additionally, academics were 1.67 times more likely than practitioners to support more global initiatives as a priority for ASPA. Age is also a consistent predictor across the models; older respondents’ perceptions of ASPA priorities were more favorable than those of their younger counterparts. Turning to gender, female respondents are 1.9 times more likely than their male counterparts to support social equity initiatives as an ASPA priority. Curiously, respondents with longer tenure in ASPA were less than favorable toward social equity and professional credentialing as ASPA priorities moving forward.
Table 4. *Impact of Selected Variables on Member Perceptions toward ASPA Priorities (odds ratios with confidence levels in parentheses)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Academic Member</th>
<th>Years in ASPA</th>
<th>Primary Association</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Chi2</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A top priority for ASPA should be promoting social equity in all aspects of government programs and policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>–0.012</td>
<td>–0.010*</td>
<td>0.420**</td>
<td>0.647***</td>
<td>–0.002</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>26.30***</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should develop its own professional credential for PA professionals.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.420*</td>
<td>–0.009*</td>
<td>0.597***</td>
<td>–0.179</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>23.87***</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should expand its focus to include international issues that affect the quality of governments worldwide.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.514**</td>
<td>0.009*</td>
<td>0.303*</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.015**</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>16.05**</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should partner with Certified Public Manager (CPM) programs to develop continuing education programs for CPMs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>–0.004</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>–0.339*</td>
<td>0.025**</td>
<td>–0.092</td>
<td>16.87**</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should create a center for nonprofit management.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.142</td>
<td>–0.001</td>
<td>0.387**</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>–0.120</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should focus more resources on influencing policy making to improve the quality of government and government services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>–0.344*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.332*</td>
<td>–0.002</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
<td>0.372**</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPA should focus more resources on a program to help new professionals further their careers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.548**</td>
<td>–0.003</td>
<td>0.377**</td>
<td>–0.090</td>
<td>0.036***</td>
<td>–0.056</td>
<td>32.19***</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p ≤ .001; **p ≤ .05; *p ≤ .10

*Note. Exp(b) in parentheses. Exp(b) = factor change in odds for unit increase in X.*
DISCUSSION

Although the results from the logistic regression do not demonstrate a breach in the academic-practitioner gap, a number of significant findings do merit further investigation. Moreover, the findings portend important pedagogical considerations for the future of public administration education. Indeed, our research warrants at the least that greater attention be placed on improved access to information and expanded avenues for illustrating practical experiences in the classroom.

For the most part, academics do not differ from nonacademics in their perception of ASPA’s utility, except that academics perceive less value from Web-based training seminars run by ASPA and efforts to create professional standards. Academics were less inclined than professionals to deem the creation and upholding of professional standards an important avenue for communication through ASPA. Perhaps academics are more interested in research versus professional norms as a means for conveying knowledge. Additionally, academics are less likely to consider Web-based training as an important avenue for communication. This finding suggests the need for further research given that nontraditional online forums have been touted as a means for bridging the academic-practitioner gap (Posner, 2009).

Connectedness is a recurring theme in the literature reviewed here for bridging the divide between academics and practitioners. Public administration classrooms are an important vehicle for connectedness, communicating reliable mechanisms through which instructors may observe and relay timely ideas and practical concepts in action—especially practices developed through scholarship and research (Bolton & Stolcis, 2003). Web-based technology represents a critical means for imparting current knowledge to public administration students, who may in turn shape future practices and research.

The results for age and education are consistent across the models for ASPA service and suggest that older members get more from ASPA benefits than do younger members. We find that older respondents are more likely to emphasize the importance of publications, continuing education, networking, and the national conference as ways of transferring knowledge. This trend holds true for more highly educated members as well. With the exception of continuing education, more educated respondents indicated greater levels of importance toward publications, professional standards, networking, and the national conference. Interestingly, female respondents, while signifying support for professional standards and the national conference, were less likely to indicate the same support for Public Administration Review in our regression analysis. Women may feel that PAR has not adequately communicated gender-related issues of importance to the field.

These are troubling findings given the advances achieved in public administration research over the last few decades (Raadschelders & Lee, 2011). Employing practice- and academic-oriented journals in the classroom as a means for conveying knowledge has been an ongoing concern in our discipline (see Newland, 2000). Perhaps the issue is not so much that applicable practices are not being addressed in public administration journals, but is more a matter of adequately conveying that knowledge in forums such as ASPA and public administration schools.
In examining Table 4, it seems that when controlling for other variables there are significant differences between academics and practitioners regarding the usefulness of several topics as priorities for ASPA. As suggested earlier (Campbell et al., 1982; Deadrick & Gibson, 2009; Hyatt et al., 1997; Sussman & Evered, 1978), there appears to be a divergence in interests between academics and practitioners regarding questions of concern for the two. Academics are more likely than practitioners to support professional credentialing, career advancement, and global issues. With respect to credentialing and career advancement, although academics perceive these topics as germane, perhaps they are not as pressing a concern for practitioners. Lending further credence to the different viewpoints of academics and practitioners is the finding for global issues. For practitioners, recent economic and fiscal crises at home may be more salient than international issues of public service. Perhaps, as Bolton and Stolcis (2003) suggest, teaching in public administration has become more theoretical and less applied. Based on this premise, public administration schools will need to become better equipped for “successfully integrating problem-identification and problem-solving strategies associated with real administrative challenges into their classrooms” (p. 628).

Partnering with key stakeholders in the academic and practitioner communities in conveying such problem-identification and problem-solving knowledge is crucial to ameliorating this problem. In fact, Web-based technologies represent a means for conveying timely access to important research and administrative skills. Public administration schools such as the Bush School at Texas A&M University and the School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Georgia have been successfully incorporating such information-technology-based methods for some time. The two schools have offered simulcast instruction for students in their respective programs on timely research and practice in public management and performance. Their initial experience produced a conference for ongoing public management research and practice as well as a flurry of publications from the classroom experience.6 Advances in Web 2.0 technologies (e.g., wikis) represent a critical means for supporting electronic communication and collaboration among academics and practitioners in the classroom. Examples of collaboration technologies include virtual teams and online meetings (e.g., Skype), e-learning, and public administration school wikis.

Turning to the other predictors, we find that age and, not surprisingly, tenure in ASPA, are consistent across the models. Older members also are significantly more likely to support expanding ASPA’s focus on international issues, influencing the policy process, and providing assistance for new professionals, among other issues. Education levels make no statistically significant difference in preference for future ASPA priorities, with the exception of affecting positive support for ASPA’s focus on influencing policy makers. Academic standing is significant in promoting support for three emergent ASPA priorities—support for new professionals, international focus, and professional credentials for public administration professionals. Perhaps there is more to the generational divide to account for
here. Younger respondents may have different priorities and topics of interest to their generation. This may be a statement of life and career stages influencing topics of interest (Jurkiewicz & Brown, 1998). Interestingly, those with longer membership in ASPA tend to look less favorably upon social equity and professional credentialing. Those who have spent more time in ASPA may feel less sanguine about the possibility of actually making a difference in these respective topics. This is a somewhat cynical finding; but the results for tenure in ASPA, although not significant, are all in the negative direction except for international issues.

CONCLUSION

The interest in addressing the intellectual gap in recent decades and concern for its expansion has stimulated discussion on the differences in academic and practitioner priorities (Newland, 2000; Raadschelders & Lee, 2011; Stivers, 2000). Interestingly, the results from our analyses indicate that the academic-practitioner dimension is not the most important statistically significant variable affecting perceptions about ASPA. To some extent, this finding suggests that the divisions between the two callings may not be as great as previously thought. It does not mean that there is not an important gap between academics and practitioners. Perhaps our survey has only scratched the surface of potential obstacles between the two groups that deserve further investigation. Indeed, further research is warranted to flesh out these differences, especially online forums for communicating and collaborating. Given the findings regarding Web-based forums, efforts should be made to explore the effectiveness of such mediums for knowledge transference in public administration classrooms. Such efforts are crucial in the face of globalization and increasing competitiveness, where firms and public agencies must be innovative, and academics need to provide a valuable source of ideas to future public administrators (Hughes et al., 2008). Van de Ven and Johnson (2006) maintain that by “leveraging their distinct competencies, groups composed of researchers and practitioners have the potential to ground and understand complex problems in ways that are more penetrating and insightful than they would be were either scholars or practitioners to study them alone” (p. 803).

Given these arguments, it is instructive to identify methods of promoting greater collaboration and connectedness and how public administration schools can add to this endeavor. Certainly, the academic-practitioner literature is rife with such suggestions. Our review of the literature suggests that opportunities for collaboration exist across many sectors and industries, including for-profit, nongovernmental organizations, and the public sector. Future research should focus on identifying models of collaboration across the sectors for common ground. It might be instructive to assess the interaction between academics and practitioners in other associations (e.g., International City/County Management Association) or across sectors (e.g., IBM’s Center for the Business of Government). An additional concern is that much of the literature focuses on how academics can
alter their behaviors to become more accessible to practitioners. More current research appears to be moving away from this argument toward the realization that the gap cannot be closed. Thus, it is more instructive for future research to address how pracademics can bridge the gap between theory and practice. Given the increasing popularity of executive education programs that encourage academic-practitioner interactions, researchers should look at how these interactions can improve policy making and business in a domestic and international context. To be sure, academic-practitioner interaction is a part of many Master of Public Administration programs. Although the research presented here does not explicitly address this issue, such collaboration between academics and practitioners in the classroom merits further investigation (Posner, 2009). Indeed, public administration programs that offer consulting services through public service outreach for political and government officials might be useful to consider in future research efforts (see Battaglio, 2008).

Finally, the consistency of results for age, education, and to some extent gender suggests that demographics might be a stronger indication of differences. Importantly, female members were less likely than their male counterparts to perceive PAR as an important medium offered by ASPA. Perhaps the knowledge gained from PAR may not “ring true” to the interests of women in the academy or field (Ospina & Dodge, 2005b). Although the influence of the academic variable controls for the others, perhaps age and education might overlay and exacerbate the academic practitioner divide, at least for ASPA. The differences demonstrated in the results begin to tell a richer story that suggests the divide between younger and older members may be important for the future of ASPA. Bolton and Stolcis (2003) suggest that with age and increasing sophistication, we learn to safeguard our rewards by creating rationales for privileging our perspectives. The findings with regard to age suggest that younger members indicate they find less utility in the services and/or priorities espoused by ASPA. ASPA services and priorities may be strained to accommodate “connectedness” among members intergenerationally (Newland, 2000). Ultimately, the survey and our findings have more direct bearing on the future of ASPA as a vehicle for communicating best practices than on the academic-practitioner divide. However, ASPA is arguably the primary means for providing the necessary brokering and neutral ground to convene academics and practitioners in common forums for public administration. So as ASPA goes, so goes our profession’s achievement of professional synergies between theory and practice—a hallmark of public administration as a professional discipline. In addition, the consistent results with respect to age across the models suggest that stages in a person’s career or life may be important considerations for the imparting of relevant topics and mediums for doing so. These results point to an attitudinal divide that must be bridged if concerns over academic-practitioner differences are finally to be overcome.
Notes

1. Given the nature of the list provided by ASPA, it is difficult to calculate a response rate. For example, the ASPA list included a number of students who may have graduated and, if they stayed in ASPA, would be included in another response category (i.e., employed by a local government). Every effort was made to obtain as many responses as possible by sending multiple e-mails asking potential respondents to participate and making the survey available online for several weeks.

2. Because the ASPA member list may not accurately reflect respondents’ current employment situation, all respondents were asked to identify their current work situation with the following question: “Which of these best describes your primary work setting?” Respondents were given these options: Federal government; State government; Local/Municipal/County government; College/University/Other academic institution; Nonprofit organization; For-profit organization (other than self-employed); Self-employed; Other (describe); Don’t know; Refuse. Based on the response to this question, we were able to assign respondents, we believe accurately, to a category of academic or practitioner by creating a dummy variable with “college/university/other institution” coded as 1 and all other categories coded 0. For more information on the questions employed in our analyses, see the appendix.

3. In Tables 1 and 2, the survey response categories for items 4 and 5 (5 is the highest level of importance for Table 1 and Strongly agree for Table 2 responses, respectively) are combined into a single response category reflecting agreement with the statements presented.

4. To ensure that our models do not violate basic assumptions of logistic regression, several diagnostic procedures were implemented, including a check for multicollinearity using Spearman correlations. Spearman correlations are more appropriate for categorical variables, because the technique does not assume a linear relationship between variables. Spearman correlations aided in hypotheses testing and the development of the models employed. The variables for reprisal and discrimination were the only policy areas consistent throughout the three data sets. Results for the Spearman correlations were excluded due to space limitations but can be provided upon request.

5. We also accounted for the possibility that age might factor into the divide between practitioners and academics. The average age of practitioners and academics surveyed was 59.4 and 54.2 respectively. Our analyses included an interaction term for age and academic members for ASPA, but no statistically significant relationship was found. Thus, age alone was a more reliable predictor than the age breakdown of the respective groups.

6. Kenneth J. Meier (Texas A&M University) and Laurence J. O’Toole (University of Georgia) sponsored the initial Public Management Conference at the University of Georgia in fall 2002. The conference brought together a set of research presentations by existing scholars along with panel discussions of issues in public management research and a mini-conference where students in the current seminar presented their own research papers. The class produced a host of scholars in public management research who have continued to make important contributions to both practice and theory (see http://perg.tamu.edu/pubmanconf.htm).
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Appendix

Questions and Variable Coding

Academic/Practitioner. Which of these best describes your primary work setting? [Federal government; State government; Local/Municipal/County government; College/University/Other academic institution; Nonprofit organization; For-profit organization (other than self-employed); Self-employed; Other (describe); Don’t know; Refuse]. Dummy variable created with “college/university/other institution” coded as 1 and all other categories coded 0.

Perceptions of ASPA Services. Listed below are five general ASPA service areas. Please rank these five service areas in order, from most important (5) to least important (1) by assigning each a value from 1 to 5, based on how much emphasis you feel ASPA should place on the service. Service areas include publications, continuing education/professional development, support and recognition for the profession, creating and upholding professional standards, and networking opportunities. Responses to survey items were coded from most important (5) to least important (1), assigning each survey item a value from 1 to 5.

Perceptions of ASPA Publications. Listed below are a variety of specific member benefits and services provided by ASPA. First, please indicate how important the service is to you, using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is “not important at all” and 5 is “very important.” Then, please rate how satisfied you are currently with the benefit or service, using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is “not at all satisfied” and 5 is “very satisfied.” Publications and services include Public Administration Review, The Public Manager, the ASPA National Conference, and Web-based Training (webinars).

Perceptions of ASPA Priorities. Next, we have a few questions about ASPA strategic decisions. Below are several statements about choices ASPA could make moving forward. Please rate your level of agreement with each using a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is “strongly disagree” and 5 is “strongly agree.”

• A top priority for ASPA should be promoting social equity in all aspects of government programs and policies.
• ASPA should develop its own professional credential for PA professionals.
• ASPA should expand its focus to include international issues that affect the quality of governments worldwide.
• ASPA should partner with the Certified Public Manager (CPM) programs to develop continuing education programs for CPMs.
• ASPA should create a center for nonprofit management.
• ASPA should focus more resources on influencing policy making to improve the quality of government and government service.
• ASPA should focus more resources on a program to help new professionals further their careers.
Demographic Variables

**Years in ASPA.** Next, we have a few questions about your ASPA membership. How many years have you been a member of ASPA? [If you’ve been a member for less than one year, please enter 0.]

**Primary Association.** Next, we have a few questions about your ASPA membership. Do you consider ASPA to be your primary professional association (e.g., the one organization that best meets your professional needs)? [Yes, No, Don’t Know, Refuse]. Coded 1 = Yes, 0 = No, all other variables treated as missing.

**Gender.** Finally, we just have a few demographic questions to ensure that the survey is representative. Are you: [Male, Female, Refuse]. 0 = male, 1 = female.

**Age.** Finally, we just have a few demographic questions to ensure that the survey is representative. In what year were you born? [year]. Recoded as age in years.

**Education.** Finally, we just have a few demographic questions to ensure that the survey is representative. What is the highest level of education you have completed? [High school graduate/GED; Associate’s Degree (2-year degree; community college); Bachelor’s Degree (4-year degree); Master’s Degree and/or Professional Degree (e.g., MBA); Doctorate (PhD, EdD, JD); Refuse]. Coded 1 = Bachelor’s Degree (4-year degree); 2 = Master’s Degree and/or Professional Degree (e.g., MBA); 3 = Doctorate (PhD, EdD, JD).